

Remarks

The Final Office Action dated September 5, 2008 noted that claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Pollard *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,082,218). Applicant traverses all of the rejections and, unless explicitly stated by the Applicant, does not acquiesce to any objection, rejection or averment made in the Office Action.

Applicant believes that the Section 102 rejections are improper for reasons stated in Applicant's responses of record, which are fully incorporated herein by reference. Generally, Applicant believes that the rejections have improperly construed the claimed invention in a manner that is inconsistent with the specification and in contrast with what one of ordinary skill in the art would understand. The Office Actions of record, as well as the remarks in the Advisory Action, have therefore improperly asserted that the image adjustment in the '218 reference corresponds to the claimed approach to using a gain factor, such as a gain factor "having a value that is inversely proportional to the contribution of the color channel signal to the total luminance of the color matrix display device." The cited image adjustment approach fails to disclose or comprehend any such adjustment, for a separated signal component of a color channel signal, based upon the color channel signal's contribution to total luminance.

Notwithstanding the above, Applicant believes that further discussion of the rejections is unnecessary because the cited '218 reference does not disclose limitations in the amended claims, as consistent with Applicant's remarks of record and the Examiner's indication in the Advisory Action. For example, the '218 reference does not disclose limitations relating to a "gain factor" that is based upon (or determined in relation to) the contribution of a color channel signal to the luminescence of a display that displays a plurality of such color channel signals. The '218 reference also fails to disclose applying such a gain factor to a separated signal component of the color channel signal, such that the gain factor applied to one or more separated signal components is set according to the respective channel signal's contribution to the total luminescence of the display.

Specifically referring to claim 1 above, the '218 reference fails to disclose applying a gain factor that is "based upon the one incident color channel signal's contribution to total luminescence of the display." Referring to claim 3, the '218 reference fails to disclose applying a gain factor that is based upon an entire color

channel signal's contribution to luminescence, to only a high-pass signal component of the color channel signal. Referring to claim 5 (and as relevant to claims 8 and 12), the '218 reference fails to disclose "determining the gain factor for the one of said signal components based upon the incident color channel signal's contribution to total luminescence of the display," where the gain factor is "inversely proportional to the contribution of the color channel to the total luminance of the color matrix display." Support for these amendments may be found throughout the specification and figures, with example embodiments shown in FIG. 2, FIG. 4 and described at paragraph 0032. In this context, the cited error correction signal enhancement in the '218 reference does not correspond to various limitations of the claimed invention.

Applicant has added new claims 13-16. Support for these claims may be found throughout the specification and figures, with examples described in connection with paragraph 0032. Applicant believes these new claims are allowable over the cited references for reasons including those discussed above, and further because the cited reference does not disclose applying a gain factor to remove a visible aliasing term, or to removing such a term by setting constants of a visible aliasing term to zero.

In view of the above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, Aaron Waxler, of NXP Corporation at (408) 474-9068.

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131

By: 

Name: Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No.: 32,122
(NXPS.477PA)

CUSTOMER NO. 65913